

ADA, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If this provision, Senator Wesely, were left in this bill, how would it hurt what is being contemplated by LB 25?

SENATOR WESELY: I don't think...I don't think it would hurt, particularly, but we were fearful again about what this may lead to, not knowing particularly what the consequences might be and we were already trying to take a step through the legislation to improve upon the situation and bring us in compliance with the ADA. So...and the department did come in and talk about their concern about that particular section, so we...actually, they wanted the other part of the section stricken as well which we retained and I can't remember what that did, particularly, but...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, because I have a great concern about groups which have been traditionally excluded from the protections that the law provides, I am unwilling to vote to strike this provision. Undoubtedly, a majority of the legislators will strike it because the department has come in and said, we don't like it. Others have said it may require us, at the state level, to comply with the terms of a federal law...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...whose terms most people at least claim to agree with. If a step is being attempted to be taken in the right direction, leaving this provision in state law would be a very good reenforcement. If there are any individuals, enterprises, entities which do not comply with the ADA, I think they should be held accountable. And, as Senator Wesely said, there's a requirement to comply with the federal law anyway, so how is the state going to say to private citizens, you must comply as far as the federal law is concerned, but the state is afraid to put this reference to the federal law in place because...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the state department is opposed to it.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. The Chair recognizes